

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/004,084	10/23/2001	Veijo V. Vanttinen	442-010623-US(PAR) 9396		
7590 04/24/2006			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Perman & Green 425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06430-6232			PATEL, JAY P		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2616		
			DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action					
Before t	he Filing	of an	Appeal	Brief	

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/004,084	VANTTINEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jay P. Patel	2616	

Belote the timing of an Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jay P. Patel	2616					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(c) \square They are not deemed to place the application in be	(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **	amaliant Amandonant	(DTOL 224)				
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 		omphant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling				
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>11</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 12-19</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
0. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. 🔲 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ///							
13. Other:	,	$\mathcal{M}^-\mathcal{U}$	•				
		1					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment filed on 12/30/2005 doesn't place the application in condition of allowance therefore the final rejection in the office action mailed 8/16/2005 is still valid. The applicant argues that the base station controller claimed in the claims is not the same as a base station subsystem; however, Silver discloses that a tunneled message is forwarded to the base station system BSS, which includes a base station contoller (figure 4 and column 8, lines 31-34) and a message bearing location information data is transmitted by the packet-switched network to the circuit-switched network gateway (column 8, lines 32-35). Therefore, the examiner maintains that the BSS disclosed by Silver and its functionalities stated in the final rejection constitute the base station controller claimed by the applicant and since message exchange takes place between packet and circuit-switched elements, Silver also anticipates communication between packet switched and circuit switched networks. Therefore, the examiner still maintains that the final rejection is valid.

NOTE; During the time the advisory action mailed 01/09/2006 was sent, the examiner overlooked the fact that the reply filed 11/16/2005 was not signed and the reply filed 12/30/2005 was signed; therefore, the present advisory replaces the one sent on 01/09/2006..